

Grandfathers and grandchildren:
Intergenerational solidarity, activity and meaning

by

Stacy Louise Alexander

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Human Development and Family Studies (Life Span Studies)

Program of Study Committee:
Peter Martin (Major Professor)
Jacques Lempers
Patricia Keith

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
2004

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the master's thesis of

Stacy Louise Alexander

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
CHAPTER 3. METHODS	18
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	32
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION	49
APPENDIX: Questionnaire for Grandparents	58
APPENDIX: Questionnaire for Grandchildren	75
REFERENCES CITED	85

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Grandparenthood as a research topic emerged during the late 1940's and 1950's as a result of demographic and social trends including increases in longevity, migration from farms to urban areas, greater independence of elders after the introduction of Social Security, and nuclear household formation (Gratton & Haber, 1996; Haber & Gratton, 1994; Hareven, 1994; Szinovacz, 1998; Uhlenberg, 1980). Two main themes in grandparenthood research stand out: the diversity of grandparents and their actions in the role, and the symbolism of grandparenthood reflected in their presence as well as their behaviors (Bengtson, 1985).

The growing body of research concerning the grandparent role points to the heterogeneity among grandparents, the dangers of over generalizing and stereotyping, and the possibility of even greater differentiation in grandparental roles in the future. (Bengtson, 1985). "Similarly, these studies emphasize the symbolic functions of grandparenthood, in addition and perhaps in contrast to directly observable behavior: Grandparents are important simply because of their presence and what they mean for a family" (Bengtson, 1985, p. 24). Grandfathers and men in general have drawn the focus of research towards them as men's roles throughout the life course have increased, and changing gender roles have influenced society's expectations of men as husbands, fathers, and grandfathers (Waldrop, 1999).

Geographic distance of grandparents and changes over time in the characteristics of the grandparent population (such as health status, economic status, educational status, and marital status) also affect intergenerational relationships (Uhlenberg & Kirby, 1998). Health status is often related to the age of the grandparent. Younger grandparents are typically

healthier and more active with their grandchildren (Crimmins, Hayward & Saito, 1994; Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002; Riley, 1990; Verbrugge, 1984).

Geographic proximity also plays a role in grandparenting. Grandparents who live closer to their grandchildren have the opportunity to be more involved in their lives (Brussoni & Boon, 1998; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Elder & Conger, 2000; Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002; Uhlenberg & Hammill, 1998). While proximity may allow more contact between grandparents and grandchildren, it does not guarantee that grandparents and grandchildren are meaningfully involved in each other's lives (Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002). The number of grandchildren grandparents have also limits how involved they can be in each grandchild's life (Elder & Conger, 2000; Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002).

Mortality conditions have improved to the point where two-thirds of all children begin life with all of their grandparents alive, and more than three-fourths have at least one grandparent alive when they reach age 30 (Uhlenberg & Kirby, 1998). Not only do children on average have more living grandparents now compared to the past, but they also have fewer siblings and cousins who compete for the attention of these grandparents. Furthermore, due to lower death rates for women in the 20th century and age differences between spouses, it is more common for grandchildren to have grandmothers alive than grandfathers. (Uhlenberg & Kirby, 1998). Concerning the age differences of spouses, typically fathers tend to be older than mothers, implying that paternal grandparents will be older than maternal grandparents as well.

Fertility patterns over time have changed the nature of grandparenthood in several interesting ways: 1) More people who are approaching old age are grandparents at the end of the last century compared to the beginning of that century, 2) Current grandparents have

fewer grandchildren than grandparents in the past, and 3) It has become more and more uncommon for grandparenting to overlap with active parenting of one's own children (Uhlenberg & Kirby, 1998). There is evidence that suggests due to changes in the timing of fertility over the past several decades, it has become less predictable to know when one will assume the grandparent role (Silverstein, 2001). Szinovacz (1998) has pointed out that nearly one third of grandparents experience grandparenthood "off time" (i.e., younger than 40 or older than 60).

Grandparent-grandchild relationships are vital to the well-being of all generations (Bengtson, 1985; Erikson, 1963; Waldrop et al., 1999). Emotional attachment to one's grandparents is a fundamental component in a child's development (Waldrop et al., 1999). Giving and receiving affection from younger generations is an important component of sound adult development (Duvall, 1971; Rodgers & White, 1993), and the establishment of healthy and affectionate bonds with grandchildren is critical to the grandparent role (Waldrop et al., 1999).

The process of sharing life experiences, family relationships, values, and attitudes with younger generations can help create an important sense of continuity and balance for older adults that helps promote successful aging (Atchley, 1989, 1992). This also correlates with the "intergenerational stake" hypothesis in that the older generation has a greater psychosocial investment, or "stake," in the joint relationship with their grandchildren than does the younger generation, and this influences the older generation's perceptions and evaluations of their common intergenerational relationships with their grandchildren (Bengtson, 2001). Grandparents want to maintain values, keep traditions, and they want their grandchildren to be like them.

The purpose of this study is to look at grandparent-grandchild relationships, particularly that of grandfather-adolescent grandchild, and to examine how grandparenting styles, lineage and gender affect that relationship. The goal of this study is to report results that can help to answer questions like, Are there generational gender, and lineage differences? Do grandfathers value their relationship with their grandchild more than their grandchildren (intergenerational stake hypothesis)? Does a grandfather's grandparenting style affect the relationship with his grandchild?

Rationale

This study opens a new door in research that incorporates perspectives from the grandfather and the adolescent, exploring how grandparent styles might affect that relationship. These two groups were chosen primarily because of gaps in past research. Large-scale empirical investigations of grandparenthood have either focused exclusively on grandmothers or have undersampled grandfathers (Baranowski, 1987; Bengtson & Robertson, 1985; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986) and address only specific racial/ethnic groups (Szinovac, 1998).

Three reasons for this gender bias in research have been identified: 1) Women are traditionally more willing to participate in research studies. 2) Grandmothers demonstrate greater interaction with their grandchildren. 3) Women have a longer life expectancy (Roberto & Stroes, 1992). There is a need for grandfathers to serve as male figures in the lives of today's children. "Most grandchildren are raised by women and, with more mothers working, by strangers" (Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981, p.187). When researchers include grandfathers in their studies, results usually report on aspects concerning the grandfather/grandmother comparison, not on relationships specifically with grandfathers

(Roberto & Stroes, 1992). Furthermore, only a small amount of research exists that focuses specifically on grandchildren's perceptions or the role grandparents play in their lives (Roberto & Stroes, 1992).

Roberto and Stroes (1992) conducted a study to examine the importance of grandmothers and grandfathers from the perspective of their young-adult grandchildren. They found that grandchildren participated in more activities with the grandmothers with whom the grandchildren perceived a stronger relationship, and they perceived the grandmothers to have a greater influence on the development of the grandchildren's values than the grandfathers. In the area of role conception, the grandmothers were rated significantly higher than grandfathers on the social and personal dimensions of grandparenthood.

Adolescent and young adult grandchildren report that their relationship with their grandparents is of great importance (Dellman-Jenkins, Papalia & Lopez, 1987; Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982). Dellman-Jenkins, Papalia and Lopez (1987) stated that there were many studies on the value of grandparents for children, but that most of the research focused on young children. Dellman-Jenkins et al.'s study was done to provide insight concerning the value of interaction with grandparents from the perspective of the adolescent grandchild. They found that adolescents regularly shared a variety of recreational activities and expressed positive feelings about spending leisure time with their grandparents. Activities provide the interaction, in which grandparents and grandchildren become familiar with each other. Through activities, grandparents and grandchildren are able to express affection (Kennedy, 1992). Dellman-Jenkins et al. recommended that future research explore whether geographic location is an important factor, because they only included adolescents in suburbs. They also

recommended that future research examine the role of gender of the adolescent, because the majority of the participants in their study were female.

Hartshorne and Manaster (1982) also conducted a study based on the perspective of adolescent grandchildren. In their study, they also reported that the grandchildren considered the relationship with their grandparents to be important, but Hartshorne and Manaster did not find out why these adolescents' grandparents were valued. How adolescents feel toward older adults will not only affect how they act toward or interact with older adults now, but will also predict how they will act as adults (Ivester & King, 1977).

A recent study conducted by Reitzes and Mutran (2004) examined grandparent identity meanings (i.e., the meaning concerning the role of grandparenthood) and grandparent centrality by using a sample that consisted of grandmothers and grandfathers. Grandparent centrality is a term introduced by Kivnick (1980) and refers to making the role of a grandparent a major priority in one's life. Reitzes and Mutran (2004) found, based on social background variables, that being married was positively related to contact with grandchildren, but this was only statistically significant for grandfathers.

Reitzes and Mutran also reported that education was negatively related to contact for both grandmothers and grandfathers. Poor health was also negatively related to grandfathers. Finally they found that grandparent identity meanings and grandparent centrality had statistically significant positive influences on contact with grandchildren, but only for grandfathers. The studies above highlight some of the research conducted on adolescents in reference to grandparents with a particular comparison of grandmothers to grandfathers, but the research is inconclusive, specifically when looking at research related to just the grandfathers.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The following review will address several topics concerning grandparenthood specifically focusing on grandfathers, gender and lineage differences, generational stake, grandparenting styles, intergenerational solidarity, intergenerational activities, and the meaning of grandparenthood. The next section provides an overview of the pertinent grandparent literature.

Grandparenthood

Grandparenthood is a transition that is not only determined by the grandparents' own characteristics and life choices but also by those of their children and grandchildren (Hagestad, 1988; Sprey & Matthews, 1982; Troll, 1985). Consequently, trends in the experience of grandparenthood reflect not only population trends in at least two generations but also behavioral dispositions within families (Szinovacz, 1998).

Several social factors have had a direct or indirect impact on emotional closeness and on the interaction between grandparents and grandchildren including geographic proximity, gender and lineage, age, life stage and timing of grandparenthood, marital and employment status, race and ethnicity, and grandparents' relationships with their own grandparents (Vanier Institute, 2003). Lineage refers to line of descent. Due to the primacy of the mother-daughter relationship in North American kinship systems, kinship relations tend to be stronger along the maternal as opposed to the paternal line (Vanier Institute, 2003).

Empirical findings of gender and lineage effects are contradictory, and the exact nature of these effects may depend on which specific aspect of the grandparent-grandchild relationship one focuses upon (Baranowski, 1987). Also of interest is the way in which generational differences may not be linear (meaning grandparent to parent or parent to child)-

that the grandchildren and grandparents may be “generational allies.” In one part of the Bengtson (1975) study focusing on intergenerational values, it was clear that the grandchildren and their grandparents displayed similar values reflecting “humanism-materialism,” whereas the perspective of the middle-aged generation (i.e., the parents) was quite different. At the same time, on another dimension (“individualism-collectivism”) there was a linear trend by generation, with the grandparents valuing collectivism most highly and the grandchildren placing higher emphasis on individualism (Bengtson, 1985). This discussion leads to the intergenerational stake hypothesis.

Generational Stake

Very limited work has been conducted on the intergenerational stake hypothesis, that is, do grandparents have a greater “stake” in the lives of their grandchildren, or do grandchildren value the relationship with their grandparents more. Harwood (2001) recently conducted a study comparing grandchildren’s and grandparents’ stake in their relationship. He found that grandparents perceived their relationship with their grandchildren considerably closer than did the grandchildren. Harwood also found that, overall, grandchildren perceived their relationship with their grandparents to be more active than do their grandparents. Studies on young adults are primarily conducted with grandmothers.

The very nature of how children view adults during early adolescence appears to undergo a development change, with researchers documenting that early adolescents are more likely to begin disagreeing with parents, become more critical of their behavior (Paikoff et al., 1988) and feel less emotionally close to parents due to the development of emotional autonomy (Creasey & Kaliher, 1994; Hill, 1988). Several studies have found that the quality of the parent-grandparent relationship influences how often the grandchild comes in contact

with the grandparent and the grandparent's role satisfaction (Reitzes & Mutran, 2004). Matthews (1983) reported that the majority of young-adult grandchildren whom she had studied felt closest to their maternal grandmother, followed by their maternal grandfather, paternal grandmother, and paternal grandfather (Vanier Institute, 2003).

A study of grandparents in three-generation families conducted by Hagestad (1985) found that grandparents' efforts to influence grandchildren were most pronounced within same-sex grandparent-grandchild dyads. Harwood (2001) reported results similar to Hagestad's, that both male and female grandchildren more frequently identified grandmothers as closest, grandsons more than granddaughters identified grandfathers as their closest grandparent. Yet Eisenberg (1988) reported that male and female grandchildren generally participated in activities with grandparents equally.

Research studies pairing grandparents and grandchildren are virtually nonexistent (Block, 2000). Giarrusso et al. (1995) were curious to explore how far down the generational lines investment of affectual solidarity extends. By replicating the intergenerational stake finding in the grandparent-grandchild relationships, findings might suggest that grandparents feel they have invested considerably more in the relationship than the grandchildren feel they have invested (Harwood, 2001). Research examining the intergenerational stake hypothesis in terms of the grandparent-grandchild relationship is helpful in understanding the extent to which grandparents and grandchildren agree on a definition of their relationship (Harwood, 2001). Compared to the small amount of research conducted on generational stake, there has been quite a bit of research conducted on grandparenting styles.

Grandparenting Styles

Early involvement with grandparents, whether considered a positive or negative experience, can influence one's own style of grandparenting (Vanier Institute, 2003). The earlier in the life of the grandchild that attachment to the grandparent is acknowledged and cemented, and the more time devoted to the growth of vital connections, the stronger the bond between grandparent and grandchild (Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981). Older persons who had grandparents that participated in activities with them as children were more likely to play the role of mentor and companion when they themselves became grandparents (Vanier Institute, 2003).

Roles played by grandparents are not static. A grandparent could have more of a nurturing role in the early years of the grandchild. As the child grows more independent, grandparents may be more likely to take on the role of mentors or advisors.

According to Neugarten and Weinstein (1964), the types of grandparenting styles, consist of the "formal," "fun-seeker," "surrogate parent," "reservoir of family wisdom," and "distant figure." The formal style applies to those who follow what they regard as the proper and prescribed role for grandparents. Although grandparents like to provide special treats and "spoil" their grandchildren, or occasionally baby-sit or help out with small tasks, formal grandparents maintain clearly demarcated lines between parenting and grandparenting, and they leave parenting strictly to the parent (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964).

Grandparents whose relationship with their grandchild involves informality and playfulness fit into the fun-seeker style. Grandparents tend to join the child in specific activities for the specific purpose of having fun, sometimes as if they were the child's playmate. The emphasis is on the satisfaction of both parties rather than on providing treats

for the grandchild (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964). The surrogate parent on the other hand predominantly applies to grandmothers. This type of relationship usually occurs when the young mother works and the grandmother assumes majority of the care taking responsibilities for the child (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964). Yet, it is possible for grandfathers to be the sole male role model in the lives of their grandchildren due to the high divorce rate, large numbers of single mothers, and resentment toward the biological father, and consequently the absence of a father in the family (Falk & Falk, 2002).

The reservoir of family wisdom style represents a distinctly authoritarian patri-centered relationship in which the grandparent is the dispenser of special skills or resources (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964). There are very distinct lines of authority, in which parents take a subordinate position to the grandparent. On the other hand, the grandparent who portrays the distant figure style typically appears from the shadows on holidays and on special occasions such as birthdays. Contact with the grandchild tends to be infrequent and fleeting, which is the characteristic that makes this style separate from the formal style (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964).

The most frequent styles of grandfathering are the formal, distant, and fun-seeker styles (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964). The fun-seeker style is more common among younger grandparents, and the formal style is more common among older grandparents. Men who have assumed the role of grandfathers feel the most important responsibilities have to do with “being there” (i.e., helping out, being a source of advice, and providing economic support in times of need and when asked to do so by their adult children, Hagestad, 1985).

In a society where grandparents range in age from 30 to 110, and grandchildren range from newborns to retirees, we should not be surprised to find a wide variety of

grandparenting styles (Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964) and few behavioral expectations regarding grandparenting (Roberston, 1977). Grandfathers appear to see themselves as advisers to young men. They think it is appropriate to seek influence over their grandchildren with regard to instrumental matters: getting an education, finding a job, dealing with money, managing life's responsibilities and challenges (Bengtson, 1985).

Grandparents sometimes devote most of their attention to a few grandchildren, or even to just one. This strategy called selective investment allows them to act like grandparents and feel satisfied with their role, even though they are not as close to the rest of their grandchildren (Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986). According to Tomlin (1998), there is limited evidence that grandparents may treat granddaughters differently than grandsons. The concept of intergenerational solidarity highlights more about the connection of family members.

Intergenerational Solidarity

Intergenerational solidarity is a way to characterize the behavioral and emotional dimensions of interaction, cohesion, sentiment, and support between parents and children, grandparents and grandchildren over the course of long-term relationships (Bengston, 2001). This study examines affectual, associational, functional, and structural solidarity.

Affectual solidarity represents the sentiments and evaluations family members express about their relationship with other members. Associational solidarity represents the type and frequency of contact between family members. Functional solidarity is the giving and receiving of support between generations. Finally, opportunity structure focuses on the geographic proximity among family members (Bengston, 2001).

Silverstein and Bengtson (1997) conducted a study that examined intergenerational solidarity in adult child-parent relationships. They found that parents' gender is important in structuring intergenerational relationships but that gender of the adult child plays a lesser role. Silverstein and Bengtson (1997) also found that there were no differences between daughters and sons in relations with fathers.

A study conducted by Mills, Wakeman and Fea (2001) examined young adult grandchildren's perceptions of affectual and consensual solidarity with their grandparents. They found that regardless of the grandparent's lineage or gender, adult grandchildren generally feel a strong emotional bond, and have perceptions of a high level of consensus. Mills, et al. confirmed past research portraying that grandchildren feel emotionally closer to maternal grandparents, especially maternal grandmothers.

The Mills, et al. study also reported that as both the grandchild and maternal grandfather aged, the level of affectual solidarity declined. For paternal grandfathers, the more education the grandchild had, the greater the perception of closeness. Overall, the relationship between adult grandchildren and paternal grandfathers was the weakest intergenerational relationship.

Lawton, Silverstein, and Bengtson (1994) also looked at family solidarity as a key variable in affection and contact. They reported that the motivations for interaction between adult children and their mothers and fathers were different. Lawton, et al. found a reciprocal effect for contact and affection in the mother-child relationship but not with the father-child relationship. Family cohesion is not the only aspect that plays a role in the grandfather-grandchild relationship. Activity level is also important to look at.

Intergenerational Activity

Grandchildren's age particularly has an impact on grandparent-grandchild interactions. "Specifically, grandchildren's age influences both the frequency of interaction between grandparents and grandchildren and the type of activities and roles grandparents assume vis-à-vis the grandchildren" (Tomlin, 1998, p.168). Grandparents seem to adjust their actions to the developmental stage of the grandchild and are affected by other commitments especially when dealing with older grandchildren (Kahana & Kahana, 1970; Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981; Tyszkowa, 1993).

Kennedy (1992) mentioned that in the past the focus of activities information has been on the meaning the activity had for the grandparent or the way in which it was carried out. His study was conducted to acquire an appreciation of the range of activities shared by grandparents and grandchildren. Kennedy also defined activities as the "vehicle for the expression of affection, the means (context) by which each gets to know the other" (1992, p. 223).

Kennedy found that the closer the grandchild felt to the grandparent, the more activities that grandchild identified as events shared with a grandparent. Gender differences appeared with grandchildren having the inclination to choose grandmothers as the closest grandparent, and sex of the grandparent and the grandchild was also a factor with ratings of most activities being associated with the female (grandmother or granddaughter) rather than the male (grandfather or grandson).

Meaning of Grandparenthood

Each grandparent defines the meaning of grandparenthood differently. In her study, Kivnick (1980) attempted to isolate verbally described meaning from various behaviors and

satisfaction levels associated with each meaning. Items were specifically phrased according to feelings about grandparenthood and its activities, rather than the activities themselves.

In a study using three different age groups of children, Kahana and Kahana (1970) found that differences in quality of perception occurred between the 4-5 year old group and the 8-9 year old group. Young children (4-5 year old group) valued grandparents mainly for being indulgent, the middle group (8-9 year old group) appreciated the fun-sharing active grandparent, and the oldest group (11-12 year old group) reflected distance from their grandparents (Kahana & Kahana, 1970). This study recommended that future research should look at both of the changing needs of grandchildren and grandparents, considering their perceptions of each other. There is little information mentioned in the literature about age differences in the meaning associated with grandfatherhood.

Neugarten and Neugarten (1986) believed that age is an important marker that gives meaning to the life course, so it seems likely that experiences associated with advancing age may change the subjective meaning of grandfatherhood. Kivnick (1980) found that a person's relationship as a child with his or her own grandparents, especially a favorite grandparent, makes a major contribution to the five dimensions of meaning: centrality (the degree to which grandparenthood is central to the lives of grandparents), valued elder (involves the activities and attitudes associated with the traditional concept of the elderly in society), immortality through clan (involves grandparents' feelings of personal immortality), reinvolvement with personal past (the ways grandparenthood allows the grandparent to relate to aspects of his or her own life history), and indulgence (attitudes of lenience and indulgence).

Hayslip, Henderson and Shore (2003) conducted a study that used Kivnick's 5-factor model of grandparental meaning. No gender differences in grandparenthood meaning were found, but the researchers felt that differences between their current findings and those of Kivnick might partially be explained by a historical shift in the meaning of grandparenting (i.e., cohort differences).

After reviewing the past grandparent literature it is apparent that there are many gaps that future research can fill. This study was an effort to expand current grandparent research through exploration of the perspective of the grandfather and grandchild on their relationship and to examine differences in grandparenting style, gender, and lineage relating to the areas of meaning, activities, and solidarity.

Research Questions.

The following questions guided the research in this thesis:

- 1) Do grandfathers value their relationship with their grandchild related to interacting in the areas of meaning, activities, and solidarity more than their grandchildren value their relationship with their grandfathers relating to the same areas (intergenerational stake hypothesis)?
- 2) Are there generational differences according to gender and lineage (i.e., granddaughters vs. grandsons and paternal vs. maternal)?
- 3) Does a grandfather's grandparenting style affect his relationship with his grandchild?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed for this study:

- 1) Maternal and paternal grandfathers have a higher “stake” or value their relationship with their grandchildren more than the younger generation does, based on the “intergenerational stake” hypothesis (Bengston, 2001).
- 2) Granddaughters are closer to their grandfathers than grandsons are.
- 3) Maternal grandfathers have higher relationship scores than paternal grandfathers, especially for maternal granddaughters.
- 4) Grandparenting styles affect relationships with grandchildren: Fun-seeking grandfathers have higher means than non-fun-seeking grandfathers, whereas the distant grandfathers have lower scores than the non-distant grandfathers in the intergenerational relationship.
- 5) The more grandchildren a grandfather has, the lower the interaction/closeness score is, because the grandfather has to divide his attention.
- 6) Predictors such as health, education and marital status are associated with positive intergenerational relationships; geographic proximity, age, and employment are associated with negative intergenerational relationships.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS

Participants

Sixth, seventh and eighth grade students and their biological grandfathers from a rural community in Southwest Iowa were recruited for this study. Students were asked to supply information about any living grandfather. Information supplied on step-grandfathers was not used in this study.

The Southwest Iowa rural middle school is a consolidated school combining three nearby towns. The towns have approximate populations of 600, 600 and 900. There were 185 students in sixth, seventh and eighth grade at the time of the study.

Students were selected for participation based on their gender, year in school and whether their biological grandfather(s) would be able to participate. Grandfathers were recruited through their relationship with their grandchild. Grandparents and grandchildren who lived in the same household were eligible to participate as long as the grandparent had not assumed the role of a surrogate parent. The data were collected in the fall of 2003.

One hundred and thirty seven, sixth, seventh and eighth graders participated in this study. There were 79 female grandchildren, 42 male grandchildren, and 16 participants did not indicate gender. Ninety-one questionnaires were sent out to grandfathers based on the contact information provided from the children or from the children's parents. A reminder postcard was sent out to grandfathers one week after the first mailing of the questionnaire. A total of 61 questionnaires were received, 27 from paternal grandfathers and 34 from maternal grandfathers, indicating a return rate of 67%.

In order to obtain a complete picture of the participants of this study, descriptive results were computed for all demographic variables. In this study, 137 children participated,

but only 121 indicated what gender they were. Out of those 121 children, 79 were girls (65.3%) and 42 were boys (34.7%). Age of the children ranged between 11 and 18 years old with a mean of 12.30 years old. Thirty-three sixth graders, 30 seventh graders, and 37 eighth graders participated. All of the children lived in rural Midwestern counties (population size <5,000 people). Finally, 92% of the children reported their ethnicity to be White, with the remaining 8% reported African American (1), Asian (1), Mexican (1), American Indian (3), or other (2) as their ethnicity.

There were 34 maternal grandfathers out of 61 grandfathers who participated. The maternal grandfathers ranged in age from 53 to 78 years old with a mean age of 66.10 years old. All of the maternal grandfathers reported their ethnicity to be White. Education level broke down into 3 main categories: high school diploma (47.1%), trade school/vocational degree (14.7%), and some high school (14.7%). All of the maternal grandfathers were married or remarried. The majority of maternal grandfathers, 28, were from Iowa (84.8%), 4 from Nebraska (12.1%) and 1 from Colorado (3%).

Like the grandchildren, 54.5% of the maternal grandfathers came from small counties, 24.2% came from larger towns (5,000-49,999 people). The majority (58.8%) of maternal grandfathers were retired, whereas 35.3% still worked fulltime. Health status reported by the maternal grandfathers ranged from “fair” to “excellent”, with 53.1% classifying themselves in good health. Grandfathers had from 2 children to 17 children, with the mean at 5.09. Maternal grandfathers also had grandchildren, with a mean of 10.90, and great-grandchildren with a mean of 3.31.

Out of the 61 grandfathers who participated, 27 were paternal. They ranged in age from 60 to 85 years old with the mean age of 70.73 years old. Like the maternal

grandfathers, all of the paternal grandfathers reported their ethnicity to be White. Education level broke down into 3 main categories: high school diploma (55.6%), trade school/vocational degree (14.8%), and some high school (14.8%). The majority (85.2%) of paternal grandfathers were married or remarried, and 4 (14.8%) were widowed.

Like the maternal grandfathers, the majority of the paternal grandfathers were also from Iowa, 21 (77.8%), 2 from Nebraska (7.4%) and 1 from Tennessee, Arkansas and Missouri (all at 3.7%). The population sizes of the towns the participants came from had a large range, with the majority coming from small communities (< 5,000 people). The majority (63%) of paternal grandfathers were retired and 37% were either still working part-time or full-time.

Health status reported by the paternal grandfathers ranged from “fair” to “excellent”, with 44.4% classifying themselves in good health and 37% as fair. Paternal grandfathers had fewer children than maternal grandfathers, ranging from 2 to 7 with a mean of 4.22. Consequently, paternal grandfathers also had fewer grandchildren ($M= 9.41$) and fewer great-grandchildren ($M= 4.38$). Results are summarized in Table 1.

Procedure

A letter was written to the principal of the school requesting permission to visit the school and distribute the questionnaire. The principal was then contacted with a follow-up visit to discuss the specifics of the future visit and the questionnaire. Parents of the student participants were sent a letter informing them of their child’s participation.

The selected school was visited in late August. Students were informed of the study and completed the questionnaires as a group in the gymnasium during homeroom class time.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Grandfathers and Grandchildren on Selected Variables

Variable	<i>N</i>	Frequency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Grandchildren				
Age of Child	102		12.30	1.08
Grade Level of Child	100		7.04	.84
Hometown's Population Size	94			
0-4,999		88		
5,000-49,999		2		
50,000-99,999		3		
100,000+		1		
Child's Ethnicity	95			
White		87		
African American		1		
Asian		1		
Mexican		1		
American Indian		3		
Other		2		
Maternal Grandfathers				
Age of Maternal Grandfather	30		66.10	6.89
Maternal Grandfather's Ethnicity	34			
White		34		
Maternal Grandfather's Education Level	34			
Some high school		5		
High school diploma		16		
Trade/Vocational degree		5		
Some college		3		
College Degree		3		
Graduate Degree		2		

(table continued)

Table 1 (*continued*).

Variable	<i>N</i>	Frequency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Maternal Grandfather's Marital Status	34			
Married or Remarried		34		
Maternal Grandfather's Home State				
Iowa	33	28		
Nebraska		4		
Colorado		1		
Hometown's Population Size	33			
0-4,999		18		
5,000-49,999		8		
50,000-99,999		3		
100,000+		4		
Maternal Grandfather's Employment Status	34			
Not employed		1		
Retired		20		
Part-time		1		
Full-time		12		
Maternal Grandfather's Health Status	32			
Excellent		7		
Good		17		
Fair		8		
Maternal Grandfather's # of Children	32		5.09	2.82
Maternal Grandfather's # of Grandchildren	31		10.90	6.30
Maternal Grandfather's # of Great-Grandchildren	13		3.31	2.72
Paternal Grandfathers				
Age of Paternal Grandfather	26		70.73	6.76
Paternal Grandfather's Ethnicity	27			
White		27		

(table continued)

Table 1 (*continued*).

Variable	<i>N</i>	Frequency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Paternal Grandfather's Education Level	27			
Some high school		4		
High school diploma		15		
Trade/Vocational degree		4		
Some college		2		
College Degree		1		
Graduate Degree		1		
Paternal Grandfather's Marital Status	27			
Married or Remarried		23		
Widowed		4		
Paternal Grandfather's Hometown	27			
Iowa		21		
Nebraska		2		
Tennessee		1		
Arkansas		1		
New England		1		
Missouri		1		
Hometown's Population Size	26			
0-4,999		15		
5,000-49,999		6		
50,000-99,999		3		
100,000+		2		
Paternal Grandfather's Employment Status	27			
Retired		17		
Part-time		3		
Full-time		7		
Paternal Grandfather's Health Status	27			
Excellent		5		
Good		12		
Fair		10		

(table continued)

Table 1 (*continued*).

Variable	<i>N</i>	Frequency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Paternal Grandfather's # of Grandchildren	27		9.41	3.58
Paternal Grandfather's # of Great-Grandchildren	8		4.38	4.98

They were given one questionnaire packet to fill out based on their paternal grandfather and one questionnaire packet based on their maternal grandfather. Identical questions were asked in each packet.

A section of the questionnaire requested the names and phone numbers of the student's parents and the names and addresses of their grandfathers. Parents were then contacted by phone to obtain contact information for the student's biological (paternal & maternal) grandfathers, if it was not supplied by the student. Grandfathers were then mailed a questionnaire, similar to the one their grandchild had previously filled out, including a self-addressed return envelope.

Measures

This study used four intergenerational scales and demographic variables to obtain the desired information from the grandfathers and adolescents who participated. The intergenerational scales included the Styles of Grandparenting, Intergenerational Solidarity Scale, Shared Grandparent/Grandchild Activities, and Grandparenthood Meaning Scale.

Styles of Grandparenting. Grandparenting styles were examined using a questionnaire developed by Crawford (1981) based on the five styles of grandparenting (fun-

seeker, surrogate parent, reservoir of family wisdom, formal, distant figure). The instrument can be found in the appendix. Typically in the past literature, grandparents have been classified into one grandparenting style. In this study, grandfathers were allowed to identify with multiple grandparenting styles, rating themselves on how strongly they identified with each style. The five items of the questionnaire were: “A grandparent is someone whom the grandchild can have a lot of fun with (fun-seeker).” “A grandparent is a second parent to his/her grandchild (surrogate parent).” “A grandparent is someone who can teach his/her grandchild how to do things (reservoir of family wisdom).” “A grandparent is someone whom the child should respect and obey (formal).” “A grandparent is someone who feels that there are other things in his/her life more important than his/her grandchild (distant).” In spite of the frequency of which grandparenting styles is referred to in the literature, little has been done to assess the validity and reliability for quantitative data, because normally grandparenting styles are assessed through qualitative interviews.

Intergenerational Solidarity Scale. Bengtson’s (1985) Intergenerational Solidarity Scale was used to measure affection, association and exchange in the grandfather/grandchild relationship. The affection section was a 13-item 6-point Likert questionnaire ranging from “not well” to “extremely well.” The instrument can be found in the appendix. A high score represents a strong relationship. Example items for affection were, “How well do you feel your grandfather understands you?” or “How well do you feel your grandchild understands you?”

As reported by Gronvold (1988), convergent validity appeared to be good for affectual solidarity, with correlations ranging from 0.68 to 0.95 for the grandparent generation and 0.42 to 0.71 for the grandchild generation. Discriminant validity was

assessed comparing mother and father scales with child measures. The average correlation for these scales was only 0.19, indicating participants distinctly evaluated these relationships (Gronvold, 1988). Variables have been used in LISREL structural equation modeling to assess the measurement model. In this study, Cronbach's alpha for affection was computed as 0.97 for children, 0.94 for maternal grandfathers, and 0.97 for paternal grandfathers.

The association section was a 9-item 8-point Likert-type questionnaire ranging from "almost never" to "almost every day" and then a single-item indicator (How often do you do things together with this grandchild?) with a 6-point range from "seldom" to "extremely often." According to Mangen and Miller (1988), intergenerational association showed reasonably high reliability and validity determined by LISREL model and alpha reliabilities. Alpha reliabilities were adequate, ranging from 0.76 to 0.87. Convergent validity of several association indicators ranged from 0.43 to 0.72 for grandparents and 0.36 to 0.72 for grandchildren (Mangen & Miller, 1988). Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing child indicators. Most of these coefficients were considerably smaller (i.e., 0.09 to 0.28) than the correlations within either the child or paternal variables. In this study, Cronbach's alpha for association was computed as 0.95 for children, 0.86 for maternal grandfathers, and 0.84 for paternal grandfathers.

The exchange section had 2-items with a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from "no, not at all" to "regularly-they get most of their support from me" and 3-items with an 8-point Likert scale ranging from "almost never" to "almost every day." An example item for exchange was, "In the past year have you given your grandchild/grandfather any financial assistance?" Reliability and validity was not reported for the exchange scale. In this study,

Cronbach's alpha for exchange was computed as 0.86 for children, 0.45 for maternal grandfathers, and 0.62 for paternal grandfathers.

Shared Grandparent/Grandchild Activities. The Shared Grandparent/Grandchild Activities scale developed by Kennedy (1992) was used to explore shared activities between grandparents and grandchildren. The questionnaire contained 29 Likert-type items with a 5 point range from 5=very characteristic to 1=not characteristic. The instrument can be found in the appendix. Answers were recoded so that a high score represents a high level of participation in shared activities. "I eat or spend the night at my grandfather's house" or "My grandchild eats or spends the night at my house," were example items from the questionnaire. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was computed as 0.93 for Kennedy's study. In this study, Cronbach's alpha for shared activities was computed as 0.98 for children, 0.93 for maternal grandfathers, and 0.93 for paternal grandfathers.

Grandparenthood Meaning Scale. In order to explore the meaning of grandparenthood, the Grandparenthood Meaning Scale (GMS, Kivnick, 1980) was used. The GMS contained 83 items, which were scored on a Likert-type scale ranging from one through seven (very strongly disagree to very strongly agree). The instrument can be found in the appendix. A high score represented a strong sense of the meaning of grandparenthood. The GMS was divided into five dimensions: centrality, valued elder, immortality through clan, reinvolvement with personal past, and indulgence. Kivnick (1980) reported that four dimensions demonstrated reliabilities greater than 0.80, and the indulgence reliability was 0.68. All five dimensions were obtained with factor analyses. Each dimension was correlated with "marker items" that had been identified to best represent that dimension. In

this study, Cronbach's alpha for meaning was computed as 0.96 for maternal grandfathers and 0.97 for paternal grandfathers.

Centrality is the degree that grandparenthood is central to the lives of grandparents. Marker items identified for societal role were used to evaluate the construct validity of centrality were, "When you don't have much to fill your time, the grandchildren seem especially important," "An important part of being a grandparent is having some concrete way to think about myself," and "Grandparenthood is not the most important thing in my life." The validity scores for centrality (i.e., the correlation between the scale and three marker items) ranged from $r = 0.53$ to $r = 0.64$. Cronbach's alpha for centrality was 0.90.

The second dimension, elder value, involved the activities and attitudes associated with the traditional concept of the wise, esteemed elder in society (Kivnick, 1980). Some component Likert items used in the questionnaire were, "It's important to me to tell my grandchildren about life while I was growing up-or they'll never know about that time in history," "It's important to be available to give your grandchildren advice, when asked," and "I value passing on cultural traditions to my grandchildren." Cronbach's alpha for elder value was 0.83. Validation for elder value relied on Neugarten and Weinstein's (1964) conceptualization on grandparenthood and on the fact that elder value and its component items seem to make conceptual sense (Kivnick, 1980).

Immortality through clan involved grandparents' feelings of personal immortality, achieved through their descendants and through the continuity of their families into the indefinite future. The statements identified for symbolic meaning (grandparenthood in terms of concepts of historical connectedness and symbolic immortality) were used to evaluate construct validity as follows: "My grandchildren are important, because they're the ones

who will carry on the family line;” “One way I think about my grandchildren is to think a part of me will keep living after I, myself, have died;” and “It gives me a sense of continuity to know that my grandchildren will have grandchildren, and that their grandchildren will probably have grandchildren of their own, and on and on... .” The validity scores for immortality through clan ranged from $r = 0.57$ to $r = 0.62$. Cronbach’s alpha for immortality through clan was 0.86.

The fourth dimension, reinvolvement with personal past, described the way grandparenthood allowed the grandparent to relate to aspects of his or her own life history. Cronbach’s alpha for reinvolvement with personal past was 0.82. Appropriate markers were also used to evaluate the construct validity of reinvolvement with personal past, as follows: “When I do things with my grandchildren, I remember being with my own grandparents” and “In being a grandparent I find myself reliving my own childhood.” The validity scores for reinvolvement with personal past ranged from $r = 0.64$ to $r = 0.65$.

Finally, the fifth dimension, indulgence, referred to the attitudes of lenience and indulgence, which are traits that grandparents are stereotypically regarded as displaying toward their grandchildren. Cronbach’s alpha for indulgence was 0.69. “Indulgence is a dimension with relatively low part-whole correlations, lower overall reliability than any other dimension, and a scope of meaning far narrower than that of any other derived dimension. Nonetheless, since it emerged intact from the iterative derivation procedure it has been retained in its current form” (Kivnick, 1980, p. 105). Example items used for Indulgence were: “A big part of being a grandparent is providing your grandchildren all kinds of treats” and “Part of being a grandparent is being giving and indulgent with the grandchildren.” The validity scores for these items ranged from 0.37 to 0.60.

Demographic Characteristics. Finally, demographic characteristics were assessed to examine background characteristics of the grandfathers and grandchildren. For the grandfathers, the characteristics that were assessed included age, education (1 = some high school to 9 = professional degree), lineage (1 = maternal; 2 = paternal), community/geographic location (recorded in miles between grandchild and grandfather), marital status (married/remarried or widowed), ethnicity, work status (1 = retired, 2 = employed), self-rated health (1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = fair, 4 = poor), and number of grandchildren. For the grandchildren, the characteristics that were assessed included age, gender, education, community/geographic location, and ethnicity.

Design and Analyses

The data analysis was conducted in five steps. In the first step, differences in intergenerational relationships between grandfathers and grandchildren were examined according to generation. This was done by comparing the means of the relationship measures of solidarity and shared activities, between the two groups, with the use of paired t-tests. Hypothesis one was based on the intergenerational stake hypothesis, and stated that there would be a difference between grandfather's and grandchildren's rating on their relationship with maternal and paternal grandfathers having a higher stake in the relationship or value it more than their grandchildren.

The second analysis step examined intergenerational linkage with regard to gender of the grandchild. This was also done by comparing means of the relationship measures of solidarity and shared activities by using an independent t-test from the perspective of both the grandparent and grandchild. Hypothesis two stated that granddaughters would be closer to their grandfathers than grandsons would be. Past literature suggests that maternal

grandparents and same-sex grandparent-grandchild dyads have stronger relationships predicting the strongest relationship between the maternal grandfather and grandson (Thomas, 1989). Literature also suggests male and female grandchildren participate in activities with grandparents equally (Block, 2000).

Step three examined intergenerational relationships along the lines of lineage. A 2(Gender) x 2(Lineage) repeated analysis variance was used to test for mean differences and interactions in gender and lineage for meaning, activities and solidarity. The hypothesis stated that maternal lines would have higher relationship scores than paternal lines, especially for maternal granddaughters.

The data analysis for the fourth step used independent t-tests to explore differences in grandparent-grandchild relationships according to grandparenting style. Hypothesis four stated that grandparenting styles would affect relationships with grandchildren and predicted that the fun-seeking style would show higher means, whereas the distant style would have the lowest scores in the intergenerational relationship.

The fifth analysis step examined predictors of intergenerational relationships. Multiple regression analysis were used to test hypothesis five and six. Hypothesis five stated that the more grandchildren a grandfather had, the lower the interaction/closeness score would be, because the grandfather would have to divide his attention. Step six stated that predictors such as health, age, education and marital status would be associated with positive intergenerational relationships, whereas geographic proximity and employment would be associated with negative intergenerational relationships.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The results of this study are reported in the following sections. Section 1 examines differences in the intergenerational relationships concerning the intergenerational stake hypothesis. Section 2 assessed gender differences in the intergenerational relationships from the grandchild's perspective and the grandfather's perspective. Lineage x Gender differences are covered in section 3. Section 4 explores differences in grandparenting styles and section 5 highlights predictors of intergenerational relationships. Finally, a review of significant findings will conclude the results section.

Descriptive Analysis

For all variables, the means and standard deviations were computed for the summary scores of affection, association, exchange, shared activities and meaning. For grandfathers and grandchildren, the average scores for affection and association were quite high. Exchange scores for grandfathers were considerably low, especially when compared to the grandchildren scores. For both grandfathers and grandchildren, the average scores for activity were quite low. All of the average scores for the meaning scale were considerably high. Results are summarized in Table 2.

Differences in Intergenerational Relationships

Hypothesis 1 stated that maternal and paternal grandfathers would have a higher "stake" or value the relationship more with their grandchildren than does the younger generation, based on the "intergenerational stake" hypothesis (Bengston, 2001). A paired t-test was computed to test whether grandfathers had a higher "stake" in the relationship with their grandchildren. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Summary Scores for Affection, Association, Exchange, Shared Activities, and Meaning

Variable	Scale Range	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Grandfathers				
Affection	13-78	60	64.12	11.41
Association	10-78	61	33.15	10.85
Exchange	5-32	60	8.93	3.51
Activity	29-232	61	66.74	24.44
Meaning				
Centrality	15-105	59	69.15	10.62
Valued Elder	13-91	60	73.95	11.85
Immortality Through Clan	13-91	60	68.00	12.55
Reinvolvement with Personal Past	8-56	60	43.03	8.39
Indulgence	4-28	60	17.88	3.70
Grandchild				
Affection	13-78	187	61.39	16.98
Association	10-78	196	39.77	19.23
Exchange	5-32	192	14.84	7.64
Activity	29-232	183	95.22	58.84

The relationship was measured with four intergenerational scales. There was no significant difference in the level of affection. The results concerning association, exchange and shared activities did not support the predicted hypothesis. Contrary to the hypothesis, the grandchildren reported significantly higher scores than did their grandfathers. Grandchildren reported more intergenerational contact, more exchanges and recalled more activities with their grandfathers. All effects were obtained from both maternal and paternal lines.

Table 3

Intergenerational Differences in Relationship Scales

Measurement	Scale Range	N	Maternal			N	Paternal		
			Child	Grand Parent	t		Child	Grand Parent	t
Affection	13-78	31	65.90 (11.54)	65.71 (9.35)	.08	26	64.08 (15.11)	61.88 (13.83)	.51
Association	78-10	34	41.00 (14.36)	31.41 (10.79)	3.22**	27	46.19 (18.63)	35.33 (10.72)	2.51*
Exchange	5-32	34	14.35 (6.04)	7.03 (1.68)	6.74***	25	16.36 (8.45)	11.20 (3.64)	2.93**
Activity	29-232	33	86.97 (50.16)	61.27 (21.44)	3.14**	26	110.92 (67.86)	75.39 (25.96)	2.34*

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The exchange scale was significant in Table 3. A paired t-test was used to examine the exchange items more in depth. Results are summarized in Table 4.

The grandchildren reported significantly higher scores than the grandfathers in receiving financial assistance, giving service assistance, receiving service assistance, and exchange of gifts. Receiving financial assistance and giving service assistance both showed strong significant differences for maternal and paternal lines. For maternal lines, intergenerational differences were also obtained for receiving service assistance.

Table 4

Exchange Scale of Intergenerational Relationships

Exchange Items	Scale Range	N	Maternal			t	N	Paternal			t
			Child	Grand Parent				Child	Grand Parent		
Giving Financial Assistance	1-4	32	1.63 (.91)	1.47 (.51)	.84		22	1.73 (1.20)	1.68 (.48)		.19
Receiving Financial Assistance	1-4	32	1.84 (.95)	1.00 (.00)	5.00***		22	1.86 (1.08)	1.00 (.00)		3.74***
Giving Service Assistance	1-8	34	3.88 (2.25)	1.85 (1.26)	4.59***		24	4.63 (2.92)	2.54 (1.32)		3.48**
Receiving Service Assistance	1-8	34	3.32 (2.43)	2.38 (1.50)	2.42*		24	3.71 (2.54)	3.29 (1.76)		.63
Exchange of Gifts	1-8	34	3.88 (2.37)	2.71 (1.12)	2.39*		25	4.68 (2.56)	3.00 (1.04)		3.06**

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Gender Differences in Intergenerational Relationships

Hypothesis 2 stated that granddaughters would be closer to their grandfathers than grandsons would be. An independent t-test was used to test this hypothesis that granddaughters are closer to their grandfathers. Results are summarized in Table 5 and 6.

This relationship was also measured with the four intergenerational scales. There were no significant gender differences in the level of affection, association, exchange and activity.

Table 5

Child's Perspective on Intergenerational Relationships

Measurement	Scale Range	Female			Male			<i>t</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Affection	13-78	62	63.97	13.74	29	61.28	19.87	.75
Association	10-78	66	39.32	16.78	29	37.55	16.41	.48
Exchange	5-32	66	14.29	7.41	29	13.48	6.17	.51
Activity	29-232	64	91.92	52.03	28	77.04	46.94	1.30

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The grandfather's perspective was measured with the meaning scale in addition to the four intergenerational scales previously used. Independent t-tests were used to examine gender differences. There was no significant difference in the level of affection, association, exchange, activity and meaning.

Table 6

Grandfather Perspective on Intergenerational Relationships

Measurement	Scale Range	Female			Male			<i>t</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Affection	13-78	38	63.21	11.59	17	65.00	10.95	-.54
Association	10-78	38	34.79	10.14	17	30.12	12.65	1.46
Exchange	5-32	38	9.08	3.63	17	7.82	3.26	1.22
Activity	29-232	38	69.45	25.96	17	60.88	21.70	1.19
Meaning	56-392	38	271.92	45.82	17	270.71	38.67	.10
Centrality	15-105	38	70.29	10.44	16	67.00	11.54	1.03
Valued Elder	13-91	38	73.42	11.94	17	72.94	11.43	.14
Immortality Through Clan	13-91	38	66.66	12.68	17	69.29	13.46	-.70
Reinvolvement with Personal Past	8-56	38	42.84	8.71	17	44.82	8.49	-.79
Indulgence	4-28	38	17.97	4.23	17	17.94	2.88	.03

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Lineage X Gender Differences

Hypothesis 3 stated that maternal lines would have higher relationship scores than paternal lines, especially for maternal granddaughters. Results are summarized in Table 7.

A 2 (Gender) x 2 (Lineage) repeated analysis variance was used to examine this hypothesis, based on the student's filling out the questionnaire twice. The results for affection, association, and exchange showed no significant differences. A significant lineage

difference was obtained for shared activities, indicating that maternal grandfathers were more involved in shared activities than paternal grandfathers. All results were produced based only on the student's perspective. The results for the activity scale should be interpreted with caution, because there were many missing data from the grandchildren who left that part of the questionnaire blank.

Table 7

Mean Ratings of Relationship Importance

Measurement	Scale Range	N	Gender		F	Lineage		F	Interaction
			Male	Female		Maternal	Paternal		
Affection	13-78	57	66.13	59.62	2.14	63.94	61.81	.60	2.54
Association	10-78	62	41.97	39.26	.26	39.94	41.30	.27	.84
Exchange	5-32	62	13.92	15.27	.45	14.30	14.89	.27	.10
Activity	29-232	33	70.65	75.63	.18	85.48	60.80	7.46*	.08

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Differences in Grandparenting Styles

Hypothesis 4 stated that grandparenting styles would affect relationships with grandchildren and predicted that the fun seeking style more than non-fun-seeking style would show higher means, whereas the distant style more than the non-distant style would have the lowest scores in the intergenerational relationship. Independent t-tests were used to examine this hypothesis. Results are summarized in Table 8-12.

These results are based on the grandchild's perspective. The participants of the study were divided into the style categories (fun-seeker, surrogate, reservoir of family wisdom,

formal and distant) according to high or low scores on the scale. For example, if the participants rated themselves a 4 or 5 for fun-seeker, then they would be considered a fun-seeker versus those who rated themselves a 1, 2, or 3. Participants could not be classified into one style category, because grandfathers were allowed to identify with multiple styles.

Only 15 grandfathers were classified as non-fun-seekers, whereas 42 grandfathers were classified as fun-seekers. A significant difference was found for the comparison of fun-seeker and non-fun-seeker: non-fun-seeker grandfathers showed significant higher scores on the meaning dimension, for immortality through clan, $t(56) = 2.42, p < .05$ (two tailed). Results are summarized in Table 8.

More grandfathers were classified as non-surrogate, but a sizeable number were classified as surrogate grandfathers. When comparing surrogate grandfathers, versus non-surrogate grandfathers, on intergenerational relationship scales, no significant differences were obtained. Results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 10 compares the grandfather classification of reservoir of family wisdom. More than twice as many grandfathers identified themselves with being a reservoir of family wisdom grandfather. When comparing reservoir of family wisdom grandfathers versus non-reservoir of family wisdom grandfathers on intergenerational relationship scales, no significant differences were obtained.

In Table 11, 52 grandfathers were classified as formal, whereas only 5 were classified as being non-formal. When comparing formal versus non-formal on intergenerational relationship scales, no significant differences were obtained.

Table 8

Style Comparison: Non-Fun-Seeker vs. Fun-Seeker

Measurement	<i>N</i>	Non-Fun-Seeker	<i>N</i>	Fun-Seeker	<i>t</i>
Family Solidarity					
Affection	15	64.87 (11.84)	42	63.38 (11.62)	.42
Association	15	32.40 (10.13)	42	33.57 (11.35)	-.35
Exchange	15	8.80 (3.47)	42	8.74 (3.27)	.06
Meaning					
Centrality	15	69.33 (12.73)	41	69.41 (10.18)	-.03
Valued Elder	15	72.00 (15.20)	42	75.07 (10.83)	-.84
Immortality through clan	15	74.80 (13.17)	42	65.88 (11.90)	2.42*
Reinvolvement with personal past	15	44.00 (8.86)	42	42.81 (8.51)	.46
Indulgence	15	18.07 (3.77)	42	17.71 (3.80)	.31
Activity	15	62.07 (16.48)	42	68.48 (26.62)	-.87

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

When examining the classification of non-distant grandfathers to distant grandfathers, the majority of grandfathers classified themselves as being non-distant. A significant difference was found for the comparison of distant and non-distant: distant grandfathers showed significant higher scores on the exchange dimension, $t(56) = 2.20$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), indicating that there were only two significant differences obtained for all grandparenting style contrasts. Therefore, results should be reviewed with caution due to the

chance of getting significant results by computing so many tests. Results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 9

Style Comparison: Non-Surrogate vs. Surrogate

Measurement	<i>N</i>	Non-Surrogate	<i>N</i>	Surrogate	<i>t</i>
Family Solidarity					
Affection	32	64.41 (11.09)	25	63.00 (12.38)	.46
Association	32	33.25 (11.54)	25	33.28 (10.43)	-.01
Exchange	32	8.63 (3.43)	25	8.92 (3.16)	-.33
Meaning					
Centrality	31	68.42 (12.35)	25	70.60 (8.59)	-.75
Valued Elder	32	72.41 (12.27)	25	76.64 (11.61)	-1.32
Immortality through clan	32	69.53 (14.45)	25	66.56 (10.23)	.87
Reinvolvement with personal past	32	43.78 (8.88)	25	42.28 (8.17)	.66
Indulgence	32	17.66 (3.87)	25	18.00 (3.70)	-.34
Activity	32	69.28 (28.64)	25	63.60 (17.61)	.87

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Because a significant difference was found concerning the exchange dimension, for the comparison of distant and non-distant grandparenting style, another independent t-test was computed to further examine the exchange scale items. It was expected that the distant style

grandfathers would give more gifts and financial assistance than would the non-distant style grandfathers. Results are summarized in Table 13.

Table 10

Style Comparison: Non-Reservoir of Family Wisdom vs. Reservoir of Family Wisdom

Measurement	<i>N</i>	Non-Reservoir of Family Wisdom	<i>N</i>	Reservoir of Family Wisdom	<i>t</i>
Family Solidarity					
Affection	17	62.18 (16.31)	40	64.45 (9.06)	-.67
Association	17	32.53 (11.08)	40	33.58 (11.05)	-.33
Exchange	17	8.35 (3.94)	40	8.93 (3.02)	-.60
Meaning					
Centrality	17	71.53 (12.68)	39	68.46 (9.91)	.98
Valued Elder	17	76.35 (11.37)	40	73.38 (12.38)	.85
Immortality through clan	17	66.53 (15.80)	40	68.95 (11.38)	-.65
Reinvolvement with personal past	17	45.41 (10.28)	40	42.15 (7.62)	1.33
Indulgence	17	17.53 (4.23)	40	17.93 (3.60)	-.36
Activity	17	65.30 (28.09)	40	67.43 (23.00)	-.30

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The results partially support this hypothesis, because the item “exchange of gifts” showed higher means for distant style grandfathers. This was the only exchange item for which a significant difference was obtained.

Table 11

Style Comparison: Non-Formal vs. Formal

Measurement	<i>N</i>	Non-Formal	<i>N</i>	Formal	<i>t</i>
Family Solidarity					
Affection	5	62.80 (22.95)	52	63.87 (10.30)	-.20
Association	5	29.20 (9.63)	52	33.65 (11.09)	-.87
Exchange	5	7.80 (3.03)	52	8.85 (3.33)	-.68
Meaning					
Centrality	5	70.40 (4.77)	51	69.29 (11.24)	.22
Valued Elder	5	73.60 (7.92)	52	74.33 (12.45)	-.13
Immortality through clan	5	63.20 (9.65)	52	68.71 (12.99)	-.92
Reinvolvement with personal past	5	43.00 (7.31)	52	43.13 (8.71)	-.03
Indulgence	5	17.40 (1.95)	52	17.85 (3.90)	-.25
Activity	5	65.80 (27.78)	52	66.88 (24.35)	-.09

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Predictors of Intergenerational Relationships

Hypothesis 5 was concerned with the prediction of intergenerational relationships. First correlations were computed to assess the bivariate relationship between number of offspring and variables of intergenerational relationships. Results yielded only one significant correlation: Number of children was negatively related to exchange, $r(59) = -0.26$, $p < .05$, indicating that grandfathers with more children engaged in less intergenerational exchange.

A multiple regression analysis was computed to examine the effect of number of offspring and lineage on intergenerational relations. Results are summarized in Table 14.

Table 12

Style Comparison: Non-Distant vs. Distant

Measurement	<i>N</i>	Non-Distant	<i>N</i>	Distant	<i>t</i>
Family Solidarity					
Affection	44	63.16 (12.57)	13	65.85 (7.35)	-.73
Association	44	32.27 (11.43)	13	36.62 (8.82)	-1.26
Exchange	44	8.25 (2.90)	13	10.46 (4.03)	2.20*
Meaning					
Centrality	43	69.42 (9.91)	13	69.31 (13.82)	.03
Valued Elder	44	74.39 (12.03)	13	73.85 (12.67)	.14
Immortality through clan	44	66.64 (12.73)	13	73.62 (11.74)	-1.77
Reinvolvement with personal past	44	42.89 (8.36)	13	43.92 (9.41)	.38
Indulgence	44	17.48 (3.50)	13	18.92 (4.52)	-1.22
Activity	44	65.55 (25.93)	13	71.00 (18.50)	-.71

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The results did not support the hypothesis, because the number of grandchildren did not predict any aspect of intergenerational relationships. Lineage did predict exchange indicating that maternal grandfathers showed more exchange.

Hypothesis 6 stated that health, education, and marital status would be positively associated with intergenerational relationships, whereas geographic proximity, age and employment would be associated negatively with intergenerational relationships. Bivariate correlations were computed to assess the relationship between predictors and variables of intergenerational relationships. No bivariate correlations were significant.

Table 13

Exchange Scale of Style Comparison: Non-Distant vs. Distant

Exchange Items	Scale Range	Non-Distant		Distant		<i>t</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	
Giving Financial Assistance	1-4	40	1.55 (.50)	12	1.42 (.51)	.80
Receiving Financial Assistance	1-4	44	1.00 (.00)	13	1.00 (.00)	
Giving Service Assistance	1-8	40	2.00 (1.11)	11	2.64 (1.50)	-1.56
Receiving Service Assistance	1-8	40	2.65 (1.56)	11	3.55 (1.97)	-1.59
Exchange of gifts	1-8	40	2.75 (.81)	12	3.58 (1.98)	-2.16*

Note. Standard deviations in parentheses. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A multiple regression analysis was used to test this hypothesis. A bivariate correlation was also used to examine the comparison of employment, health, age of grandparent, education,

marital status and geographic proximity. Results are summarized in Table 15. No significant predictors were obtained in this analysis.

Table 14

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Intergenerational Relationships

Family Variables		Affection	Association	Exchange	Meaning	Activity
Number of Kids	<i>B</i>	-.42	-.74	-.18	1.39	-1.82
	<i>SE B</i>	.68	.61	.16	2.49	1.38
	β	-.09	-.17	-.12	.08	-.18
Number of Grandkids	<i>B</i>	-.44	-.21	.02	1.62	-.39
	<i>SE B</i>	.31	.28	.07	1.12	.62
	β	-.20	-.10	.03	.20	.18
Lineage	<i>B</i>	1.00	2.19	4.37	15.43	8.50
	<i>SE B</i>	3.27	2.93	.76	11.93	6.60
	β	.04	.10	.62***	.18	.18

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

To conclude the results section, several interesting findings can be summarized. Examining the intergenerational relationship tables, grandchildren reported more intergenerational contact, more exchanges and recalled more activities with their grandfathers. There were no significant gender effects. There were very few significant differences when comparing grandparent styles.

Table 15

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Grandfather's Value of the Relationship with Their Grandchild

		Affection	Association	Exchange	Meaning	Activity
Employment	<i>B</i>	.43	2.35	.16	7.14	-.13
	<i>SE B</i>	3.35	3.10	.98	12.75	7.13
	β	.02	.11	.02	.08	-.00
Health	<i>B</i>	-.22	-1.41	.87	1.24	-5.79
	<i>SE B</i>	2.33	2.15	.68	8.86	4.96
	β	-.01	-.09	.18	.20	-.17
Age of Grandparent	<i>B</i>	.17	-.20	.09	.74	-.22
	<i>SE B</i>	.23	.21	.07	.87	.48
	β	.10	-.14	.18	.12	-.07
Education	<i>B</i>	-1.16	-.38	.02	.14	-.52
	<i>SE B</i>	.96	.89	.28	3.65	2.04
	β	-.17	-.06	.01	.01	-.04
Marital Status	<i>B</i>	.12	.09	-.26	-.08	-1.65
	<i>SE B</i>	2.14	1.98	.63	8.12	4.55
	β	.01	.01	-.06	-.00	-.05
Geographic Proximity	<i>B</i>	-.01	.00	-.00	.00	-.01
	<i>SE B</i>	.01	.01	.00	.03	.02
	β	-.22	.08	-.17	.00	-.07

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Significant differences were found for the comparison of distant and non-distant grandfathers on the exchange dimension concerning exchange of gifts and for the comparison of fun-seeker and non-fun-seeker grandfathers on the meaning dimension concerning immortality through clan. Finally, family structural variables did not predict intergenerational relationships like hypothesized.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine whether maternal and paternal grandfathers had a higher “stake” or valued the relationship more with their grandchildren than did the younger generation or to examine whether granddaughters have a closer relationship to their grandfathers than grandsons would. Some other predictions stated that: maternal lines would have higher relationship scores than paternal lines and grandparenting styles would affect relationships with grandchildren. Finally, concerning family structural variables it was expected that the more grandchildren a grandfather had, the lower the interaction/closeness score would be, and predictors such as health, age, education and marital status would be associated with positive intergenerational relationships, whereas geographic proximity and employment would be associated with negative intergenerational relationships.

Several results turned out differently than what had been predicted. Contrary to the first hypothesis, grandchildren reported more intergenerational contact, more exchanges and recalled more activities than did their grandfathers. Granddaughters and grandsons were equally close to their grandfathers, and the only significant lineage difference was obtained for shared activities, indicating that maternal grandfathers were more involved in shared activities than paternal grandfathers.

Concerning grandparenting styles, only two significant differences were found. One significant difference was found the comparison of distant and non-distant grandfathers: Distant grandfathers showed significant higher scores on the exchange dimension. The next significant difference was found for the comparison of fun-seeker and non-fun-seeker grandfathers: Non-fun-seeker grandfathers showed significant higher scores on the meaning dimension. Lineage did predict exchange, indicating that maternal grandfathers showed

more exchange, but the number of grandchildren did not predict any aspect of intergenerational relationships. Finally, no significant differences were obtained for health, age, education, marital status, geographic proximity, or employment.

Differences in Intergenerational Relationships

For hypothesis 1, contrary to the “intergenerational stake” hypothesis, the grandchildren who participated in this study reported significantly higher scores than did their grandfathers. Harwood (2001) found that grandparents view their relationships with their grandchildren considerably closer than the grandchildren perceive the relationship. Yet grandchildren perceived their relationship with their grandparents to be considerably more active than do their grandparents (Harwood, 2001).

This study’s results support Harwood’s findings that grandchildren do perceive their relationship with their grandparents to be more active. Yet in contrast to Harwood’s findings, this study found that grandchildren reported having a higher “stake” in the relationships with their grandfather. Harwood (2001) concluded by saying that, “The findings combine to tell us that grandparents and grandchildren often share quite different perceptions of their relationships” (p.205).

Help from young to old is a dominant theme in intergenerational relations. This study also produced results supporting that help flows from young to old and from old to young, maternal and paternal grandfathers showing strong significant differences for receiving financial assistance, giving service assistance and exchange of gifts. For maternal grandfathers, intergenerational differences were also obtained for receiving service assistance.

Harwood (2001) explained why there were intergenerational differences in association and exchange. “Given grandchildren’s and grandparents’ different perceptions of relational closeness, it is possible that they have different expectations for the prevalence of particular behaviors within the relationship. Thus, grandchildren may “count” a behavior as having occurred based on a single incident. In contrast, grandparents may only respond affirmatively, if it is a regular, ongoing feature of the relationship” (p.205).

Grandchildren also might overestimate the relationship or think more highly of their grandfather than their grandfathers realize. For example one grandfather wrote a side note on his questionnaire saying, “It’s not really fair to consider this survey, because I don’t live close to my grandchildren and therefore have little influence on their lives.” If more grandfathers felt this way, then it would help to explain the higher scores for the grandchildren.

Gender Differences in Intergenerational Relationships

Hypothesis 2 stated that granddaughters would be closer to their grandfathers than grandsons would. There were no significant differences in this study, but results are similar to Eisenberg’s (1988) study that male and female grandchildren generally participated in activities with grandparents equally. But these results contradict a study of grandparents in three-generation families reported by Hagestad (1985), who found that grandparents’ efforts to influence grandchildren were most pronounced within same-sex grandparent-grandchild dyads.

Finding no significant differences implies that granddaughters and grandsons feel the same way about their grandfathers. Hagestad’s (1985) study was conducted almost 20 years ago, and perhaps relationships have changed, and lineage does not affect the grandparent-

grandchild relationship anymore. Maybe gender differences are overestimated in today's society. More research needs to be done in this area, because there is too much contradictory research.

Lineage Differences

Hypothesis 3 stated that maternal lines would have higher relationship scores than paternal lines. The only significant lineage difference was obtained for shared activities, indicating that maternal grandfathers were more involved in shared activities than paternal grandfathers. Perhaps this is due to the fact that maternal lines tend to be stronger, usually implying that there is more contact between grandchildren and their maternal grandparents. This finding, that lineage is important, is supported in the literature. Due to the primacy of the mother-daughter relationship in North American kinship systems, kinship relations tend to be stronger along the maternal line as opposed to the paternal line (Vanier Institute, 2003).

Age seems to play an important role with lineage effects as well. Maternal lines might be stronger due to the fact that paternal grandfathers tend to be older. Maternal grandfathers might be more likely to engage in shared activities because it is easier to be active when you are younger (Kennedy, 1992). "The significantly higher activity ratings given by grandchildren with younger grandparents bears out the indications in the literature of the influence of age on grandparenting style and types of shared activity" (Kennedy, 1992, p.225). In this study, age was not a significant predictor of intergenerational relationships for meaning or activity.

Differences in Grandparenting Styles

Hypothesis 4 was concerned with grandparenting styles. It stated that grandparenting styles would affect relationships with grandchildren – with the fun-seeking style having the

highest scores and the distant style having the lowest scores. The participants of the study were divided into style categories (fun-seeking, surrogate, reservoir of family wisdom, formal and distant) according to high or low scores on the scale.

A high/low division was used, because participants could not be classified into one style category, expressing that multiple styles could describe them. Much of the literature available classifies grandparents into only one category. Future research should take into consideration that grandparents, in this case grandfathers, could identify with multiple grandparenting styles.

Significant differences were found for the comparison of distant and non-distant grandfathers on the exchange dimension and for the comparison of fun-seeker and non-fun-seeker grandfathers on the meaning dimension. By examining the exchange dimension for the distant versus non-distant style, grandfathers reported significantly high scores in “exchange of gifts.” Perhaps this is due to the fact distant grandfathers make up for the lack of time physically spent with the grandchild by sending gifts, money, etc.

The comparison of fun-seeker versus non-fun-seeker grandfathers showed non-fun-seeker grandfathers with significant higher scores on the meaning dimension for immortality through clan. Perhaps non-fun-seeker grandfathers take their relationship with their grandchildren more seriously and feel stronger about passing on the family traditions to their grandchildren.

A reason why there were not more differences for grandparenting styles could be due to the low sample size or that a wide range of relationship types was possible in this relationship, contradicting the stereotypical conceptions of what a grandparent-grandchild relationship “should” look like (Harwood, 2001).

Predictors of Intergenerational Relationships

Hypothesis 5 stated that the more grandchildren a grandfather had, the lower the interaction/closeness score would be, because the grandfather would have to divide his attention. This hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Perhaps the reason why this hypothesis was not supported was due to declining fertility rate, meaning there are fewer grandchildren born. Even though there were some outliers of grandfathers who had a large number of grandchildren, most grandfathers had only a few grandchildren. Perhaps grandfathers do not have to divide their attention so much, because they do not visit with all of his grandchildren all at one time. A final reason why this hypothesis was not supported might be that every opportunity the grandfather and grandchild have together is wonderful, and both the grandfather and the grandchild appreciate any and all attention.

Hypothesis 6 stated that predictors such as health, education and marital status would be associated with positive intergenerational relationships, whereas geographic proximity, age, and employment would be associated with negative intergenerational relationships. None of those variables were significant predictors of intergenerational relationships.

Health status is often related to the age of the grandparent; younger grandparents tend to be healthier and more active with their grandchildren (Crimmins, Hayward & Saito, 1994; Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002; Riley, 1990; Verbrugge, 1984). Geographic proximity also plays a role in grandparenting. Grandparents who live closer to their grandchildren have the opportunity to be more involved in their lives (Brussoni & Boon, 1998; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Elder & Conger, 2000; Uhlenberg & Hammill, 1998). Although proximity may allow more contact between grandparents and grandchildren, it does not

guarantee that grandparents and grandchildren are meaningfully involved in each other's lives (Mueller, Wilhelm & Elder, 2002).

Perhaps the reason why this study did not find any geographic proximity differences is that one might underestimate the strength of a relationship across many miles. Physical distance may not be an important factor when considering the many ways to stay in contact (i.e., telephone, email, instant messenger, etc.) Just because grandfathers and grandchildren are apart physically does not mean there could not be a close relationship between the grandfather and grandchild. Or maybe people, young and old, are just more financially secure in today's society, allowing them to travel more frequently, making it easier to maintain contact with grandchildren.

This study has a number of limitations, including that some results may have been skewed due to outliers. The sample size was relatively small. A comparison school declined to participate, because there were no direct benefits to the school district. Another reason the sample size was low could be that it was a rural sample, limiting the number of students to draw from. With a small sample size, it makes it difficult to generalize the findings.

The questionnaire that the grandchildren completed was not age appropriate to 6th, 7th & 8th graders causing missing data. Students had difficulty understanding some terms, such as "financial," "residence," and "GPA." The questionnaire also turned out to be too long to complete in the time slot the principal provided. The students were rushed through the questionnaire, consequently causing them to leave some sections unanswered.

How the questionnaire was put together turned out to be a limitation as well. Some of the demographic information was left blank mostly due to the time constraint combined with the fact that it was the last page of the questionnaire. For future research, a more adolescent-

friendly questionnaire, shorter in scope and conducted during a larger time slot, needs to be considered.

The grandfather questionnaire would benefit, if a qualitative section were added. Many grandfathers wrote side notes on their questionnaires about how much they loved their grandchildren, regardless of how often they saw them. For example, one wife who helped her husband fill out the questionnaire wrote, "Like we said (before), this (questionnaire) makes him look like he's not a very good grandfather, but he is. We just don't hardly get to see them much. He loves his grandchildren, and I'm sure they love him." The grandfathers wanted to make sure that the researcher understood that they were good grandfathers regardless of how the questionnaire portrayed them.

One grandfather wrote, "I was raised by my grandparents so this (questionnaire) is a surprise to me. They meant a lot to me." A qualitative section would allow grandfathers to express their feelings about their grandchildren and allow the questionnaire to provide a more complete well-rounded picture of the grandfather.

This study needs to be replicated in urban environments and other rural settings to see how these results compare to other settings. Perhaps rural intergenerational relationships are different than other rural or urban relationships. Research also needs to include factors of the parent generation to test the extent to which parents mediate the grandparent-grandchild relationship. Kennedy (1992) wrote that the changing concepts of fathering underscore the need to pursue further understanding of the experiences of grandfathers.

Given the results that the grandchildren rated the contact with their grandfathers so highly, grandchildren may tribute grandfathers a more important role than the grandfather or society might realize. They are surrogate fathers, educators, and role models. Whether it is

what they give or do with their grandchildren or what their grandchildren do or give in return
– the relationship between a grandfather and his grandchildren is very important indeed.

APPENDIX:
Questionnaire for Grandparents

1. Styles of Grandparenting

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = not at all characteristic
- 2 = not characteristic
- 3 = neither characteristic or uncharacteristic
- 4 = very characteristic
- 5 = extremely characteristic

1. As a grandfather I am someone whom my grandchild can have a lot of fun with.

1 2 3 4 5

2. As a grandfather I am a second parent to my grandchild.

1 2 3 4 5

3. As a grandfather I am someone who can teach my grandchild how to do things.

1 2 3 4 5

4. As a grandfather I am someone whom my child should respect and obey.

1 2 3 4 5

5 As a grandfather I am someone who feels that there are other things in my life more important than my grandchild.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Intergenerational Solidarity Scale, Affective Solidarity

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = not well
- 2 = not too well
- 3 = some
- 4 = pretty well
- 5 = very well
- 6 = extremely well

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How well do you feel your grandchild understands you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. How well do you feel your grandchild trusts you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. How fair do you feel your grandchild is toward you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. How much respect do you feel your grandchild has for you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. How much affection do you feel your grandchild has for you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. How well do you understand your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. How much do you trust your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. How fair do you feel you are toward your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. How much do you respect your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. How much affection do you feel toward your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. How is communication between yourself and your grandchild? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. Generally, how well do you and your grandchild get along together? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

3. Intergenerational Solidarity, Associative Solidarity

WITH YOUR GRANDCHILD, HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THE FOLLOWING?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Response Options:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = about once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recreation outside the home (movies, picnics, swimming, trips, hunting, and so on) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. Brief visits for conversation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. Family gatherings like reunions or holiday dinners where a lot of family members get together | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. Small family gatherings for special occasions like birthdays or anniversaries | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. Talking over things that are important to you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. Religious activities of any kind | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. Writing letters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. Telephoning each other | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. Dinner together | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

How often do you do things together with this grandchild?

- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Not too often
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Pretty often
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Extremely often

In the past year have you given your grandchild any financial assistance?

- ☐ No, not at all
- ☐ Infrequently
- ☐ Regularly – I partially support them
- ☐ Regularly – they get most of their support from me

In the past year, have you received any financial assistance from your grandchild?

- ☐ No, not at all
- ☐ Infrequently
- ☐ Regularly – I partially support them
- ☐ Regularly – they get most of their support from me

4. Intergenerational Solidarity, Functional Solidarity

HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THE FOLLOWING?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Response Options:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = about once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

Your helping your grandchild out with chores or errands?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Your grandchild helping you out with chores or errands?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Do you exchange gifts with your grandchild?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

5. Grandparent/Grandchild Shared Activities

HOW CHARACTERISTIC ARE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = about once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. My grandchild and I are together with other family members in family events, holidays, reunions, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. My grandchild eats or spends the night at my house. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. My grandchild and I watch TV together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. My grandchild and I talk together about recent events in each other's lives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. My grandchild and I like just being together "messaging around," "puttering," "being ornery." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. I go out to eat with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. My grandchild and I play games together-cards, bingo, charades, puzzles, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. My grandchild goes shopping with me to get things that I need. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. My grandchild and I share recreational activities, e.g., fishing, picnics, camping, boating. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10. My grandchild helps me with gardening and yard work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. My grandchild goes on drives in the country
–sightseeing, visiting-with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 12. I talk with my grandchild about personal concerns. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 13. I talk on the phone with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14. I attend sports events, plays, and other activities
in which my grandchild is participating in. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 15. My grandchild helps me cook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 16. I provide childcare, take my grandchild to school,
and help to care for my grandchild when they
are ill. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17. My grandchild learns skills from me-crafts, arts,
sports, music. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 18. My grandchild helps me with the housework. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 19. I attend church with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 20. When I am sick, my grandchild helps to care
for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 21. I take my grandchild shopping with me, so I
can buy them gifts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 22. My grandchild shares in crafts and hobbies
(crocheting, wood-working, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 23. I take walks with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 24. My grandchild and I read books and tell
stories together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 25. go on vacations or trips with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 26. My grandchild and I attend sports and other
community events together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27. I plan/prepare parties and other celebrations
with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 28. My grandchild helps with business, farm or other
employment activity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 29. My grandchild and I write letters to each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

6. Grandparenthood Meaning Scale

Response Options:

- 1 = Very strongly disagree
- 2 = Strongly disagree
- 3 = Disagree
- 4 = Neutral
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly agree
- 7 = Very strongly agree

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I think I'm a typical grandfather. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. My grandchildren influence how good or bad I think about myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. An important part of being a grandparent is having some concrete way to think about myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. Other things in my life are more satisfying than being a grandparent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. I like to see my grandchildren more than anything else I can think of. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. An important part of grandparenthood is the new level of meaning and fullness it has added to my life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. Grandparenthood is not the most important thing in my life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. My grandchildren are my main reason for living. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. My grandchildren keep me young. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. When you don't have much to fill your time, the grandchildren seem especially important. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. The more time my grandchildren spend with me the better I like it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. I am one of those people whose life revolves around my grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. You always wish for grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. When you don't have many people to love or to love you, grandchildren seem especially important. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Being a grandparent has an effect on how good or bad I feel about myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. I think it's important to have individual relationships with each grandchild, based on their individual personalities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. I value the fact that my grandchildren confide in me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. I don't really have any thoughts about how I want my grandchildren to remember me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. I value being able to teach things to my grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. I want to be a part of my grandchildren's memories of their childhood years. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. A benefit of being a grandparent is having contact with young people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. As a grandparent it's important to feel needed and helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. It's important to me to carry on family traditions with my grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. It's important to me to tell my grandchildren about life while I was growing up-or they'll never know about that time in history. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. It's important to be available to give your grandchildren advice, when asked. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. I value passing on cultural traditions to my grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. For my grandparenthood is a relationship in which the pleasure far outweighs the pain. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. It's important to me that my children present me to my grandchildren as someone special. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. It's nice for the grandchildren to be able to share secrets with me that they can't share with their parents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 30. I feel responsible for my grandchildren's financial well-being in the future. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. I feel that my grandchildren belong to me as well as to their parents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32. It's important to me to see the influence of my own ideas in my grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33. My grandchildren are important because they're the ones who will carry on the family line. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34. As a grandparent it's important to me that my opinion influence other people in the family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 35. As a grandparent it's important to me that I be respected by everyone in the family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36. A major way I think of grandchild is as a new member of our family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37. As grandparents I think we should be at the center of our clan. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38. It's nice to be a grandparent when most of your friends are grandparents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39. As a grandparent I feel I really should look after the whole family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40. You get sort of a thrill when someone says about one of your grandchildren, "He's just like his grandfather," or "She's just like her grandmother." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41. One way I think about my grandchildren is to think that a part of me will keep living after I, myself, have died. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42. It gives me a sense of continuity to know that my grandchildren will have grandchildren, and that their grandchildren will probably have children of their own, and on and on ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43. I measure out the rest of my life in terms of milestones in the grandchildren's lives. You know, like I'd like to live to see this one married, to see that one graduate, to see this one have a child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44. When I watch my grandchildren do things (like play ball or act in a play) it's just as if I were doing those things myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45. When I do things with my grandchildren I remember being with my own grandparents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46. Part of being a grandparent is reliving my own,earlier adulthood. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47. In being a grandparent I find myself reliving my own childhood. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48. Being a grandparent has made me think about my own grandparents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49. It's important to me to try to emulate my grandparents, to walk in their footsteps. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50. One way I think about my grandchildren is to think that a part of me will keep living after I, myself, have died. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51. It gives me a sense of continuity to know that my grandchildren will have grandchildren, and that their grandchildren will probably have children of their own, and on and on ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 52. I measure out the rest of my life in terms of milestones in the grandchildren's lives. You know, like I'd like to live to see this one married, to see that one graduate, to see this one have a child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 53. Part of being a grandparent is being lenient with the grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 54. Part of being a grandparent is being giving and indulgent with the grandchildren. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 55. Part of being a grandparent is being tolerant of the grandchildren's mistakes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 56. A big part of being a grandparent is providing your grandchildren all kinds of treats. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

7. Demographics**Year of Birth** _____**Circle One:** Paternal Grandfather
(Your son's father)Maternal Grandfather
(Your daughter's father)Place an '**X**' next to the **ONE** that most describes you.**Ethnic Background**

_____ White/Caucasian

_____ African American

_____ Asian American

_____ Mexican American

_____ American Indian

_____ Other _____ (Please Specify)

Highest Level of Education Achieved:

_____ Some high school

_____ High school diploma

_____ Trade school or vocational degree

_____ Some college (1 to 2 years)

_____ Associate Arts degree

_____ College degree

_____ Some past graduate degree

_____ Graduate degree

_____ Professional degree

Marital Status

- ☐ Never Married
- ☐ Married or Remarried
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Widowed

Geographic Location

Where is your place of residence? _____.

What is the approximate population size?

- ☐ 0 – 4, 999
- ☐ 5,000 – 49,999
- ☐ 50,000 – 99,999
- ☐ 100,000 +

Employment

- ☐ Not employed
- ☐ Retired
- ☐ Part-time
- ☐ Full-time
- ☐ Volunteer

Current or Last Occupation _____.

How would you rate your overall health at the present time?

____ Excellent

____ Good

____ Fair

____ Poor

Number of Children _____.

Number of Grandchildren _____.

Number of Great-Grandchildren _____.

You have completed our survey. Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX :

Questionnaire for Grandchildren

1. Styles of Grandparenting

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = not at all characteristic
- 2 = not characteristic
- 3 = neither characteristic or uncharacteristic
- 4 = very characteristic
- 5 = extremely characteristic

1. My grandfather is someone who I can have a lot of fun with.

1 2 3 4 5

2. My grandfather is a second parent to me.

1 2 3 4 5

3. My grandfather is someone who can teach me how to do things.

1 2 3 4 5

4. My grandfather is someone whom I should respect and obey.

1 2 3 4 5

5. My grandfather is someone who feels that there are other things in his life more important than me.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Intergenerational Solidarity Scale, Affective Solidarity

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = not well
- 2 = not too well
- 3 = some
- 4 = pretty well
- 5 = very well
- 6 = extremely well

1. How well do you feel your grandfather understands you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. How well do you feel your grandfather trusts you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. How fair do you feel your grandfather is toward you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. How much respect do you feel your grandfather has for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. How much affection do you feel your grandfather has for you? 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. How well do you understand your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. How much do you trust your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. How fair do you feel you are toward your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. How much do you respect your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. How much affection do you feel toward your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. How is communication between yourself and your grandfather? 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Generally, how well do you and your grandfather get along together? 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Intergenerational Solidarity, Associative Solidarity

WITH YOUR GRANDFATHER, HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THE FOLLOWING?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Response Options:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = about once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recreation outside the home (movies, picnics, swimming, trips, hunting, and so on) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. Brief visits for conversation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. Family gatherings like reunions or holiday dinners where a lot of family members get together | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. Small family gatherings for special occasions like birthdays or anniversaries | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. Talking over things that are important to you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. Religious activities of any kind | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. Writing letters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. Telephoning each other | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. Dinner together | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

How often do you do things together with this grandfather?

- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Not too often
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Pretty often
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Extremely often

In the past year have you given your grandfather any financial assistance?

- ☐ No, not at all
- ☐ Infrequently
- ☐ Regularly – I partially support them
- ☐ Regularly – they get most of their support from me

In the past year, have you received any financial assistance from your grandfather?

- ☐ No, not at all
- ☐ Infrequently
- ☐ Regularly – I partially support them
- ☐ Regularly – they get most of their support from me

4. Intergenerational Solidarity, Functional Solidarity

HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THE FOLLOWING?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Response Options:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = about once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

Your helping your grandfather out with chores or errands?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Your grandfather helping you out with chores or errands?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Do you exchange gifts with your grandfather?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

5. Grandparent/Grandchild Shared Activities

HOW CHARACTERISTIC ARE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS?

Please **CIRCLE** the **ONE** that most describes **YOU**.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = almost never
- 2 = about once a year
- 3 = several times a year
- 4 = every other month or so
- 5 = bout once a month
- 6 = about once a week
- 7 = several times a week
- 8 = almost every day

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. My grandchild and I are together with other family members in family events, holidays, reunions, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. My grandchild eats or spends the night at my house. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. My grandchild and I watch TV together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. My grandchild and I talk together about recent events in each other's lives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. My grandchild and I like just being together "messaging around," "puttering," "being ornery." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. I go out to eat with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. My grandchild and I play games together-cards, bingo, charades, puzzles, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. My grandchild goes shopping with me to get things that I need. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. My grandchild and I share recreational activities, e.g., fishing, picnics, camping, boating. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10. My grandchild helps me with gardening and yard work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. My grandchild goes on drives in the country
–sightseeing, visiting-with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 12. I talk with my grandchild about personal concerns. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 13. I talk on the phone with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14. I attend sports events, plays, and other activities
in which my grandchild is participating in. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 15. My grandchild helps me cook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 16. I provide childcare, take my grandchild to school,
and help to care for my grandchild when they
are ill. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17. My grandchild learns skills from me-crafts, arts,
sports, music. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 18. My grandchild helps me with the housework. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 19. I attend church with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 20. When I am sick, my grandchild helps to care
for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 21. I take my grandchild shopping with me, so I
can buy them gifts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 22. My grandchild shares in crafts and hobbies
(crocheting, wood-working, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 23. I take walks with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 24. My grandchild and I read books and tell
stories together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 25. go on vacations or trips with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 26. My grandchild and I attend sports and other
community events together. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27. I plan/prepare parties and other celebrations
with my grandchild. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 28. My grandchild helps with business, farm or other
employment activity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 29. My grandchild and I write letters to each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

6. Demographics

Age ____

Circle One: Female Male

Grade Level ____

Grade Point Average ____

Place an 'X' next to the **ONE** that most describes you.**Geographic Location**

Where is your place of residence? _____.

What is the approximate population size?

____ 0 – 4, 999

____ 5,000 – 49,999

____ 50,000 – 99,999

____ 100,000 +

Ethnic Background

____ White/Caucasian

____ African American

____ Asian American

____ Mexican American

____ American Indian

____ Other _____ (Please Specify)

Parent(s) Name and Phone Number(s) _____

You have completed our survey. Thank you for your participation!

REFERENCES CITED

- Atchley, R. (1989). A continuity theory of normal aging. *The Gerontologist*, 29, 183-190.
- Atchley, R. (1992). What do social theories of aging offer counselors? *The Counseling Psychologist*, 20, 336-340.
- Baranowski, M. D. (1987). The grandfather-grandchild relationship: Meaning and exchange. *Family Perspective*, 24(3), 201-215.
- Bengtson, V. L. (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. *American Sociological Review*, 40(3), 358-371.
- Bengtson, V. L. (1985). Diversity and symbolism in grandparental roles. In V. L. Bengtson & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), *Grandparenthood* (pp. 11-25). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bengtson, V. L., & Robertson, J. F. (1985). *Grandparenthood*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1-16.
- Block, C. E. (2000). Dyadic and gender differences in perceptions of the grandparent-grandchild relationship. *Intergenerational Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 51(2), 105-113.
- Brussoni, M. J., & Boon, S. D. (1998). Grandparental impact in young adults' relationships with their closest grandparents: The role of relationship strength and emotional closeness. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 42, 267-286.

- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1985). Styles and strategies of grandparenting. In V. L. Bengtson & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), *Grandparenthood* (pp. 97-116). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1986). *The new American grandparent: A place in the family, a life apart*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Crawford, M. (1981). Not disengaged: Grandparents in literature and reality, an empirical study in role satisfaction. *Sociological Review*, 29(3), 499-519.
- Creasey, G. L., & Kaliher, G. (1994). Age differences in grandchildren's perceptions of relations with grandparents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 411-426.
- Crimmins, E. M., Hayward, M. D., & Saito, Y. (1994). Changing mortality and morbidity rates and the health status and life expectancy of the older population. *Demography*, 31, 159-175.
- Dellman-Jenkins, M. Papalia, D., & Lopez, M. (1987). Teenagers' reported interaction with grandparents: Exploring the extent of alienation. *Lifestyles*, 8, 35-46.
- Duvall, E. (1971). *Family development*. (4th Ed.) New York: J.B. Lippincott.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1988). Grandchildren's perspectives on relationships with grandparents: The influence of gender across generations. *Sex Roles*, 19(3/4), 205-217.
- Elder, G. H. Jr., & Conger, R. D. (2000). *Children of the land: Adversity and success in rural America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: Norton.
- Falk, U. A., & Falk, G. (2002). *Grandparents*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

- Giarrusso, R., Stallings, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1995). The “intergenerational stake” hypothesis revisited: Parent-child differences in perceptions of relationships 20 years later. In V. L. Bengtson, K. W. Schaie, & L. M. Burton (Eds.), *Adult intergenerational relations: Effects of societal change* (pp. 227-263). New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Gratton, B., & Haber, C. (1996). Three phases in the history of American grandparents: Authority, burden, companion. *Generations*, 20, 7-12.
- Gronvold, R. (1988). Measuring affectual solidarity. In D. J. Mangen, V. L. Bengtson, & P. H. Landry, Jr. (Eds.), *Measurement of intergenerational relations*. (pp. 74-97). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haber, C., & Gratton, B. (1994). *Old age and the search for security: An American social history*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hagestad, G. O. (1985). Continuity and connectedness. In V. L. Bengtson & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), *Grandparenthood* (pp. 31-48). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hagestad, G. O. (1988). Demographic Change and the Life Course: Some emerging trends in the family realm. *Family Relations*, 37, 405-410.
- Hancock, P., Mangen, D. J., & McChesney, K. Y. (1998). The exchange dimension of solidarity: Measuring intergenerational exchange and functional solidarity. In D.J. Mangen, V. L. Bengtson, & P. H. Landry, Jr. (Eds.), *Measurement of Intergenerational Relations* (pp. 156-186). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hareven, T. K. (1994). Family change and historical change. In M. W. Riley, R. L. Kahn, & A. Foner (Eds.), *Age and structural lag* (pp.130-150). New York: Wiley.

- Hartshorne, T. S., & Manaster, G. J. (1982). The relationship with grandparents: Contact, importance, role conception. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 15, 233-245.
- Harwood, J., McKee, J., & Lin, M. C. (2000). Younger and older adults' schematic representations of intergenerational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 67, 20-41.
- Harwood, J. (2001). Comparing grandchildren's and grandparents' stake in their relationship. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 53, 195-210.
- Hayslip, B. Jr., Henderson, C. E., & Shore, R. J. (2003). The structure of grandparental role meaning. *Journal of Adult Development*, 10(1), 1-11.
- Hill, J. P. (1988). Adapting to menarche: Familial control and conflict. In Gunnar, M. and Collins, W. (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Development Vol 21*, (pp. 43-77). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ivester, C., & King, K. (1977). Attitudes of adolescents toward the aged. *The Gerontologist*, 17(1), 85-89.
- Kahana, B., & Kahana, E. (1970). Grandparenthood from the perspective of the developing grandchild. *Developmental Psychology*, 3, 98-105.
- Kennedy, G. E. (1992). Shared activities of grandparents and grandchildren. *Psychological Reports*, 70, 211-227.
- Kivnick, H. Q. (1980). *The meaning of grandparenthood*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International Research Press.

- Kornhaber, A., & Woodward, K. L. (1981). *Grandparents/grandchildren*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Lawton, L., Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. (1994). Affection, social contact, and geographic distance between adult children and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 57-68.
- Mangen, D. J., & Miller, R. B. (1988). Measuring intergenerational contact in the family. In D. J. Mangen, V. L. Bengtson, & P. H. Landry, Jr. (Eds.), *Measurement of intergenerational relations*. (pp. 74-97). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mills, T. L., Wakeman, M. A., & Rea, C. B. (2001). Adult grandchildren's perceptions of emotional closeness and consensus with their maternal and paternal grandparents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 427-455.
- Mueller, M. M., Wilhelm, B., & Elder, G. H. (2002). Variations in Grandparenting. *Research on Aging*, 24(3), 360-388.
- Neugarten, B. L., & Neugarten, D. A. (1986). Age in an aging society. *Daedalus*, 115(1), 31-49.
- Neugarten, B. L., & Weinstein, K. K. (1964). The changing American grandparent. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 26(2), 199-204.
- Paikoff, R. L., Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (1988). Perceptions of efficacy and legitimacy of paternal influence techniques on children and early adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 201-220.
- Peterson, E. T. (1989). Grandparenting. In S. J. Bahr and E. T. Peterson (Eds.), *Aging and the Family*. (pp. 159-174). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. (2004). Grandparenthood: Factors influencing frequency of grandparent-grandchildren contact and grandparent role satisfaction. *Journal of Gerontology, 59B*, S9-S16.
- Riley, J. C. (1990). The risk of being sick: Morbidity trends in four countries. *Population and Development Review, 16*, 403-432.
- Roberto, K. A., & Stroes, J. (1992). Grandchildren and grandparents: Roles, influences, and relationships. *Intergenerational Journal of Aging and Human Development, 34*(3), 227-239.
- Roberto, K. A., Allen, K. R., & Blieszner, R. (2001). Grandfathers perceptions and expectations of relationships with their adult grandchildren. *Journal of Family Issues, 22*(4), 407-426
- Robertson, J. F. (1977). Grandparenthood: A study of role conceptions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39*, 165-174.
- Rodgers, R. H., & White, J. M. (1993). Family development theory. In P. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods. A Contextual Approach* (pp. 225-254). New York: Plenum.
- Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationships in American families. *The American Journal of Sociology, 103*(2), 429-460.
- Silverstein, M., & Marengo, A. (2001). How Americans enact the grandparent role across the family life course. *Journal of Family Issues, 22*(4), 493-522.

- Sprey, J., & Matthews, S. H. (1982). Contemporary grandparenthood: A systemic transition. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 464, 91-103.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1998). Grandparent research: Past, present, and future. In M. E. (Ed.), *Handbook on grandparenthood* (pp.1-20). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1998). Grandparents today : A demographic profile. *The Gerontologist*, 38(1), 37-52.
- Thomas, J. L. (1989). Gender and perceptions of grandparenthood. *Intergenerational Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 29(4), 269-282.
- Tomlin, A. M. (1998). Grandparents' influences on grandchildren. In M.E. (Ed.), *Handbook on grandparenthood* (pp.159-170). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Troll, L. E. (1985). The contingencies of grandparenting. In V.L. Bengtson & J.F. Robertson (Eds.), *Grandparenthood*. (pp. 135-149). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tyszkowa, M. (1993). Adolescents' relationships with grandparents: Characteristics and developmental transformations. In S. Jackson & H. Rodriguez-Tome (Eds.), *Adolescence and its social world* (pp.121-143). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Uhlenberg, P., & Hammill, B. G. (1998). Frequency of grandparent contact With grandchild sets: Six factors that make a difference. *The Gerontologist*, 38, 276-285.
- Uhlenberg, P., & Kirby, J. B. (1998). Grandparenthood over time: Historical and demographic trends. In M. E. (Ed.), *Handbook on grandparenthood* (pp.23-39). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Uhlenberg, P. (1980). Death and the family. *Journal of Family History*, 5, 313-320.

Vanier Institute of the Family. Sources of Diversity in Grandparent-Grandchild

Relationships. Retrieved February 26, 2003, from <http://www.vifamily.ca/cft/grandpt/SOURCES.HTM>.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1984). Longer life but worsening health? Trends in health and mortality of middle-aged and older persons. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 62, 474-519.

Waldrop, D. P., Weber, J. A., Herald, S. L., Pruett, J., Cooper, K., & Juozapavicius, K. (1999). Wisdom and life experience: How grandfathers mentor their grandchildren. *Journal of Aging and Identity*, 4(1), 33-46.